REMARKS

Claims 2-20 remain in this application. Of those claims, Claims 4-17 stand allowed and Claims 2-3 and 18-20 stand rejected as anticipated by *Zornes* (US 5,456,076).

Claim 2 is amended to incorporate the substance of former parent Claim 1, and to recite further elements that distinguish over the applied art. The Applicant submits that the elements added to Claim 2 do not require further search nor present any new issue, inasmuch as those elements were previously presented, for example, in Claim 4.

The Examiner again objects to the specification as lacking a brief description of the drawing section. The Applicant respectfully traverses this objection, as it appears to overlook the amendment on page 2 of the response filed July 22, 2004. That amendment added a brief description of the drawing figures, as previously required.

Turning now to the rejection, the Examiner expresses amazement that the Applicant "has argued *Zornes* does not disclose an outer piston and an inner pistons". That statement mischaracterizes the Applicant's actual remarks. On page 7 of the First Response, the Applicant pointed out that *Zornes* comprises neither a *dual* external piston nor a *dual* internal piston. The Applicant then pointed out that *Zornes* comprises two single cylinders separated from each other, and "each having inside a single internal piston". The Applicant thus recognizes that *Zornes* does indeed disclose an outer piston and an inner piston, but also points out that those pistons are single in number.

Zornes himself teaches that each power module of his engine has a single inner piston assembly and a reciprocating cylinder assembly. Please see paragraph 11, lines 15-17. That arrangement is best illustrated by figure 8 of *Zornes*.

Basic structural differences between the present invention and the *Zornes* are most clearly illustrated by comparing the apparatus shown in Applicant's Figure 1 with the schematic showing in Figure 8 of *Zornes*. Claim 2 requires a dual cycle hot gas engine characterized by a dual external piston axially moveable within a basic cylinder, and a dual internal piston axially moveable inside the dual external piston. Claim 2 also now recites that both the dual external piston and the dual internal piston each comprise two double-acting single pistons rigidly connected with each other. Thus, dual internal pistons 3.1 and 3.2 are rigidly connected with each other by piston rod 3.3. Likewise, the dual external piston 2 comprises the two external pistons 2.1 and 2.2 rigidly connected with each other by the piston rod 2.3. This arrangement of the Applicant's invention is described commencing at page 2, line 24 through page 3, line 19 of the specification. Claim 2 also requires that the rigid interconnections between the dual external and dual internal pistons extend through the central partition, forming two like spaces in the interior of the basic cylinder member 1.

Zornes does not anticipate a dual-cycle hot gas engine having the structural limitations set forth in Claim 2. Referring to figure 8 of *Zornes*, even if the single external piston (within the outer cylinder) is somehow viewed as the Applicant's dual external piston, that reference lacks "a central partition in parallel with [the two outer end walls of the basic cylinder member]", so that the reference also fails to disclose the rigid interconnection with the dual internal piston and the dual external piston, "extending through the central partition". Accordingly, *Zornes* cannot anticipate an engine comprising the limitations recited in Claim 2.

Claim 3 depends from Claim 2 and further requires, in the central partition of the basic cylinder member, a central bore to receive at least one sliding seal. *Zornes* lacks the partition, and so that reference also lacks the central bore in the partition to receive at least one sliding seal. Accordingly, that reference cannot anticipate Claim 3.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 1 and are considered novel over *Zornes* for the reasons set forth above. Likewise, Claim 20 depends from Claim 19 and is considered novel for those same reasons.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicits a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: November 23, 2004

Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE